REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the office action dated May 19, 2008, and completion of the personal interview of July 15, 2008. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and summarized herein. The Examiner's acceptance of the amended specification and drawings filed on January 29, 2008, and withdrawal of the previous rejections of claims 3 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are noted with appreciation. Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 11, and 14-17 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 13, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,892,251 to Anderson et al. (*hereinafter*, "Anderson"). Claims 2 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 14-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,862,104 to Yajima et al. (*hereinafter*, "Yajima"). In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

By way of review, the subject application is directed to a system and method for processing a document from a portable data storage device. A portable data storage device is received into a document rendering device, wherein the portable data storage device inclusive of at least one electronic document stored in a native application format from which it was generated. Administrative data representative of document processing privilege is received and a document service associated with the document rendering device is activated in accordance with such received data upon insertion of the portable data storage device. The native application format of the at least one electronic document is tested relative to capabilities of the associated document rendering device and a display corresponding to a plurality of available document processing operations available on the at least one electronic document is generated in accordance with an output of the testing. Selection data is received from an associated user corresponding to at least one document processing operation selected from the plurality thereof

reflected on the generated display. Operation of the associated document rendering device is then commenced in accordance with received user input and available document processing operations.

Conversely to the forgoing, Anderson is directed to a system that determines an application needed for a particular document format, and that application is used in order to allow for a document to be printed. If the printer is unable to itself print a document that is already in a printer-ready format, the document is sent to a host computer where an application is selected and used to send a print-ready document back to the printer for rendering. The subject application teaches a system by which a user is given options as to a received electronic document, which options are dependent on the particular file format. By way of example, in one embodiment, a user selects an electronic file in a particular bitmapped file format. The device tests this format, and determines that it has sufficient capability to print the document, fax the document or attached it to an e-mail message. The user interface then reflects these options, and the user can select one or more of them. In another example, the device may not understand the file type at all, so the user may be relegated to an option to attach the document to an electronic mail, and only this option will be displayed on a panel and selectable by the user. No communication to a host is made for conversion, and no application is automatically selected based on file format.

Amendment to each of independent claims 1 and 11 has been made to render more clearly the patentable distinctions over the art of record. As amended, each claim now includes limitations wherein a file format is tested, and a user is presented with a plurality of device options available given the limitations of the device and the file format. The user then selects one or more operations from the options listed. This is far removed from the teachings of the art of record.

In accordance with the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art, and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/31282.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _7/21/08_

Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009